

Reply to October 2, 2010 Office Communication  
Under 37 CFR 1.116  
Technology Center 2121

Application No.: 10/575,173

Docket No.: 06005/41124

**REMARKS**

Each of claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11-14, and 19-29 remains pending and at issue in this application, with claims 1, 14, and 19 being independent claims.

Claims 1, 14 and 19 are amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 14 and 19 may be found, for example, in the specification at paragraphs [0076] and [0104]. Independent claim 14 is further amended to correct informalities and to correct antecedent basis.

Claim 6 is amended, and support for the amendments to claim 6 may be found, for example, in original claim 10 and in paragraph [0036]. Claim 26 is amended in the self-explanatory manner seen above to address informalities.

No new matter is added by these amendments.

**Claim Objections**

Claim 14 stands objected to because of alleged informalities. Claim 14 is amended in the self-explanatory manner seen above to address this objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections**

Claim 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claim 6 is amended in the self-explanatory manner above to address this rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections**

Each of claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11-14, and 19-29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,165,226 to Thurner et al. (hereinafter "Thurner"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and respectfully request reconsideration in light of the amendments and the following remarks.

Applicants respectfully submit the Office Action has not demonstrated a *prima facie* case of anticipation for independent claim 1. In particular, the Office Action construed a single element of Thurner, i.e., the "related object" of Thurner 4:10-13, to be two different elements of claim 1, i.e., the "same graphic element" and the "same graphical element object." However, this single reference to Thurner's "related object" may not be used as

Reply to October 2, 2010 Office Communication  
Under 37 CFR 1.116  
Technology Center 2121

Application No.: 10/575,173

Docket No.: 06005/41124

allegedly teaching two distinct elements of claim 1: "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). In other words, because independent claim 1 recites two distinct elements: 1) a "same graphic element," and 2) a "same graphical element object," the Office Action must provide support that Thurner also discloses two distinct elements. The Office Action failed to do so, as it only cited to the single "related object" of Thurner, 4:10-13 as allegedly teaching both the "same graphic element" and the "same graphical element object" of independent claim 1.

To this point, independent claim 1 recites that the "same graphic element" is "bound to a same graphical element object." If the Office Action's allegation that Thurner's related object is both the "same graphic element" and the "same graphical element object" is used, then Thurner's related object must be bound to itself, which does not make sense. For at least these reasons, the Office Action did not establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation for independent claim 1.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Thurner does not disclose each and every element recited by independent claim 1. For example, Thurner does not disclose at least the element: "a same graphic element included on each of the two or more real-time displays and bound to a same graphical element object of the plurality of graphical element objects." The Office Action construed the "two or more real-time displays" recited by claim 1 to be Thurner's panes or display areas. However, throughout Thurner's disclosure, Thurner consistently describes a first object viewed on one pane and a *related* (but not the *same*) object viewed on a different pane. For example, see Thurner, 4:1-3 ("... selection of an object in either pane results in a corresponding refocusing of the other pane on a related object"), Thurner, 5:6-9 ("... a semantic link can connect a function block (i.e. a part of a PLC program) with the document describing the function block"), and Thurner: 5:33-35 ("... selection of a New Plant in the Tree pane automatically causes the upper pane (U) to refocus on an electrical wiring diagram."

As such, Thurner does not disclose at least the element recited by independent claim 1: "a same graphic element included on each of the two or more real-time displays and bound to a same graphical element object of the plurality of graphical element objects." Instead, Thurner merely discloses mapping objects ("Within the Industrial Framework Server, the data structures within adapted applications are graphically mapped in order to

Reply to October 2, 2010 Office Communication  
Under 37 CFR 1.116  
Technology Center 2121

Application No.: 10/575,173

Docket No.: 06005/41124

provide any information," Thurner, 7:39-42), or coupling views ("The Multiple Coupled Browser Views Workbench of the present invention provides use of a display device... to couple several views of a manufacturing plant such that, if the user navigates through one view, all coupled views adjust their focus accordingly, Thurner, 3:58-62).

For at least the above reasons, Thurner does not teach or disclose each and every element of independent claim 1, as amended, and accordingly, a *prima facie* case of anticipation cannot be established for independent claim 1 by using Thurner. Independent claim 14 and 19 each recite elements similar to independent claim 1. Dependent claims incorporate by reference each and every element of their respective independent claims. For at least reasons similar to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of anticipation also has not and cannot be established for claims 4-6, 8, 11-14 and 19-29 by using Thurner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11-14 and 19-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance for the reasons provided above. Although Applicants believe that no fees or petitions are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 13-2855 of Marshall, Gerstein & Borun, LLP under Order No. 06005/41124. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the foregoing comments or any claim amendments deemed needed to result in allowance, Applicants kindly request the Examiner to contact the undersigned by telephone at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 20, 2010

By: Lilian Y. Ficht  
Lilian Y. Ficht  
Registration No.: 64,514  
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP  
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300  
Willis Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357  
(312) 474-6300  
Patent Agent for Applicants